UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,051	07/10/2003	Koji Omae	240067US90	9779
	7590 08/19/200 AK, MCCLELLAND 1	EXAMINER		
1940 DUKE STREET			MURRAY, DANIEL C	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2443	
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/19/2009	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/616,051	OMAE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Branze of Morarda	2440
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>06 August 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application (RCE) in compliance with 37 (periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed	it, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07 (Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing data.	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee inally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	pliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NO	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in being appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a	tter form for appeal by materially red	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		scied ciairris.
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		,
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al  non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	llowable if submitted in a separate,	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ll be entered and an explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good answas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>		
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.
The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowance because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
/Tonia LM Dollinger/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2443		

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

Application No.

Continuation of 11: The arguments with respect to "the address of the peripheral node not being stored in the node storage unit of the search node" appear to be the same as those presented in the previous Office Action dated 10JUN2009. As these arguments have all been addressed in the previous Office Action and as there have been no changes to the claims nor the arguments there appears to be nothing to reconsider at this time.

Furthermore, during the interview with Applicant's representative on 22JUL2009 the claimed feature of "transmitting the node notice packet from the peripheral node to the search node, in response to the node notice request packet" was also discussed. The arguments with respect to this claimed feature appear to be the same as those presented in the previous office action despite the discussion during the interview regarding this particular feature. According to Applicant's specification and the discussion during the interview the node notice packet is transmitted directly from the peripheral node to the search node, in response to the node notice request packet. It was clearly stated by the Examiner during the interview that while the current claims language encompassed this particular transmission path it was also sufficiently broad as to encompass a number of transmission paths (e.g. transmitting the node notice packet back along the path of the node notice request packet rather than a direct path as suggested by Applicant) disclosed in the prior art and in what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art with regard to discovery and/or peer to peer networks as known in the art. However, it appears that Applicant has neglected to include these in the arguments presented or amend the claims accordingly at this time.